1

24

25

26

27

28

2 3 4 5 6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 7 8 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 9 10 KIM CHUN and SRY CHOU, 11 No. CIV-S-04-1098 GEB (DAD) Plaintiffs, 12 ORDER\* v. 13 U.S. POSTAL SERVICE, 14 Defendant. 15 16 17 On May 27, 2005, Defendant moved for dismissal on the 18 grounds that it is not a proper party defendant and that service of 19 process has not been effected. Alternatively, Defendant moved for 20 summary judgment. No opposition to Defendant's motion was filed. 21 Since the factual and legal assertions in Defendant's motion 22 have not been controverted, and Defendant's specific averments 23 demonstrate that Plaintiffs' lawsuit against the U.S. Postal Service

eo nomine is based on a tort, it is obvious that Plaintiffs have sued

defendant in [a tort] action." Kennedy v. United States Postal Serv.,

the wrong defendant. "[T]he United States is the only proper party

 $<sup>^{\</sup>star}$  This matter was determined to be suitable for decision without oral argument. L.R.  $78-230\,(h)$ .

## Case 2:04-cv-01098-GEB-DAD Document 25 Filed 06/30/05 Page 2 of 2

```
145 F.3d 1077, 1078 (9th Cir. 1988). Therefore, Defendant's motion to
 1
 2
    dismiss is granted and this action is dismissed.
 3
          IT IS SO ORDERED.
 4
    Dated: June 30, 2005
 5
                                       /s/ Garland E. Burrell, Jr.
                                       GARLAND E. BURRELL, JR. United States District Judge
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
```